REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are amended herein. Support for the amendment can be found, *e.g.*, in the instant Specification at pg. 3, ll. 6-34 and pg. 5, ll. 20-27. Claim 6 is cancelled. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 remain pending in the Application.

Claim 1 was objected to for informality, which was a typographical error resulting in the misspelling of "parameterization." Applicant has corrected the error and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over *Business Wire* ("I-Logix Brings XML-Based XMI Standard to the Real-Time Marketplace, Driving Enterprise Collaboration and Paving the Way for Collaborative Commerce," Sept. 26, 2000) in view of *Sodifrance* ("Model-in-Action," May 2003). Claims 5-11 are rejected as obvious over *Business Wire* in view of *Sodifrance* in further view of Ben Campbell et al. ("Tortoise CVS," 2003, hereinafter "Campbell"), *Doldi* ("Validation of Communications Systems with SDL: the Art of SDL Simulation and Reachability Analysis," 2003), and Lau (U.S. 6,598,219). The rejections are respectfully traversed based, at least in part, on the above amendment and the following remarks.

"In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences <u>themselves</u> would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention <u>as a whole</u> would have been obvious." MPEP § 2141.02 <u>citing</u> *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ

871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Schenck v. Nortron Corp.*, 713 F.2d 782, 218 USPQ 698 (Fed. Cir. 1983). When examining the differences between amended independent claim 1 and *Business Wire* and *Sodifrance*, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim would not be obvious.

Amended independent claim 1 recites "associating the file generation engine tool with a scripts parameterization application" amongst its features. The Office has asserted that this feature would be obvious based on a passage in *Sodifrance* that describes scripts that Model in Action (MIA) provides. *See, e.g.*, Office Action at pg. 3. Applicants respectfully submit that this citation of *Sodifrance* would not render the recited feature obvious, as MIA is utilized in conjunction with a scripts parameterization application with which it can be associated (i.e., the scripts parameterization application is inherently a separate application). As recited in claim 1 and described in *Sodifrance*, MIA is a file generation engine tool and not a scripts parameterization application. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not obvious. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

However, in an effort to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1 to more particularly recite the production of files in C. To that end, amended claim 1 now recites "wherein the generation report file includes the files of generated C code, wherein the configuration management batch files are Clearcase batch files for Clearcase scenarios, and wherein the configuration management batch files automatically update the Clearcase table according to information contained in the generation report file." By more particularly reciting the batch files, the configuration

management batch files are explicitly not "a script that the configuration tool can run" as cited by the Office from *Sodifrance*. They are the batch files related to the Clearcase scenarios, i.e., files from the generated C code, not those for use by the file generation engine tool.

Moreover, these specific files from the generated C code are not mentioned in *Business Wire* or *Sodifrance*, alone or in combination. The report file including all of the files of generated code is not taught, suggested, or rendered obvious by *Business Wire* or *Sodifrance*, alone or in combination. The configuration management batch files are not taught, suggested, or rendered obvious by the references alone or in combination. For at least these reasons, amended independent claim 1 is not obvious. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

"If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." MPEP 2143.03 <u>citing</u> *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The dependent claims are allowable at least based on their dependence on allowable claims. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-5 and 7-11 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

Kenneth M. Berner

Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: August 2, 2010
KMB/SK/bjs